

From: Thomas Trevethan <tltrevehan@gmail.com>

Sent: Monday, April 30, 2018 5:16 PM

To: Planning <Planning@a2gov.org>

Subject: Two reservations of a citizens concerning the Lockwood development in the Sister Lakes neighborhood.

I request that these remarks be read for the 5-1 Planning Commission meeting.

First, the Ann Arbor PUD ordinances require a developer to work together with citizens early in the planning process and to continue to work together throughout the planning stages. **None of this happened.** Only in the last weeks of this planning process were there meetings with concerned citizens, and none of these were about “working together” in the least. Lockwood did gather a few folk to sell their project. In those meetings they did not interact about citizen reservations, consistently saying that they were in compliance with Ann Arbor’s planning. So much for working together, as local ordinances require. I would submit that the Planning Commission ought to be very careful about embracing Lockwood and its stance towards Ann Arbor citizens. Second, I wish I could say that city planning staff have been sterling in their treatment of citizen concerns. Their report, *Lakewood PUD Staff Report*, sadly fails to attend to citizen reservations in at least three ways:

(1) The report fails to even note the depth of residents’ opposition to the Lockwood plan. More than 90% of those who have attended meetings, whether those that were organized to resist Lockwood or those that Lockwood sponsored, came away from those meetings rejecting Lockwood’s plan.

(2) Nor does the Report ever mention or recognize the volume of correspondence back and forth from concerned citizens. It makes one wonder if the planning staff themselves ever considered any of this correspondence. Are the opinions and concerns of citizens of no significance to city employees? The city’s PUD ordinances give citizens an important role in the planning process. Citizens’ views should be given respectful and thoughtful consideration on the part of developers, Lockwood not least. The same might be said to city planning staff, as well.

(3) The *Lakewood PUD Staff Report* repeatedly asserts “the development would not cause a nuisance or detrimental effect on the public health, safety, and welfare.” “Nuisance” suggests a low standard of harm as we evaluate concerns for health, safety, and welfare. I would suggest that a walk around the site and the small neighborhood of homes adjacent to it make it obvious to the observer that the “welfare” of citizens is certainly and recklessly endangered. One wonders if any of the planning staff have ever visited the site. It is clear that a massive, three story building, sited within 15 feet of small houses, with 40 ft high lighting, 3 commercial dumpsters for garbage and trash, and truck traffic for deliveries to a commercial kitchen and pick up of waste and trash will degrade the quality of living of that immediate neighborhood to say nothing about what it will do to the market value of their property. It seems incontestable that their welfare will be diminished.

“Detrimental” is more serious. Surely there is no risk here that is so severe that it rises to this level. But I fear there is a serious “health” hazard lurking in this development. I remind you that this neighborhood was the place where Gelman’s notorious *1.4 dioxane* discharges and the plume it created were discovered. Citizens from this neighborhood have suffered the most harm from the contamination. So, we are very concerned that their safety be treated with all due respect. It is very concerning, then, that this project will involve the sealing off a “critical” (according to MDEQ Dan Hamel) monitoring well for the dioxane plume. I would be concerned if Ann Arbor planning staff were indifferent to this profoundly “detrimental” health concern.

Thomas L. Trevethan
323 Mason Ave, Ann Arbor, MI